REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6 are Currently Amended. Claims 12-42 are cancelled. Claims 1-11 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that the application be forwarded onto issuance.

§ 101 REJECTIONS

Claims 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 6 as amended recites the element "the namespace including functionality to allow application-defined calculations to be performed." Applicant respectfully submits that for at least this reason the claim recites statutory subject matter, obviating the grounds for the 101 rejection.

§ 102 and §103 Rejections

Claims 29-30 and 32-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WindowsXP Guide.

Claims 1-5 and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WindowsXP Guide in view of Cadiz and further in view of Nolan.

Claims 6-11, 31, and 36-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WindowsXP Guide in view of Cadiz.

Claims 1 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WindowsXP Guide in view of Cadiz and further in view of Miller.

Claims 1 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WindowsXP Guide in view of Cadiz and further in view of Bramnick.

Claims 12-14, 16-17, and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WindowsXP Guide in view of Cadiz, Nolan, and further in view of Bramnick.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WindowsXP Guide in view of Cadiz, Nolan, and further in view of Ault.

The Claims

Claim 1 recites a programming interface embodied on one or more computer-readable storage media comprising:

- a hierarchical namespace including a set of types for a user interface organized into the hierarchical namespace, the hierarchical namespace including functionality to allow application-defined calculations to be performed;
- a top level identifier prefixed to the name of each group in the hierarchy so that the types in each group are referenced by a hierarchical name that includes the selected top level identifier prefixed to the name of the group containing the type;
- a first group of services related to re-usable user interface controls, the first group of services including a control that allows preview images of items to be displayed;
- a second group of services related to user interface dialogs and user interface wizards, the second group of services including a first dialog to allow files and folders to be opened and saved;
- a third group of services related to extending the user interface functionality, the third group of services including functionality to allow identification of application-defined thumbnails; and
- a fourth group of services related to extending functionality of a desktop of the user interface, the fourth group of services including functionality to allow a sidebar to be displayed on the desktop, wherein the first and second and third and fourth groups of services are defined by respective namespaces of the programming interface.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office argues that the subject matter is obvious over WindowsXP Guide in view of Cadiz, and further in view of Nolan, Miller,

or Bramnick. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, this claim has been amended to recite, as suggested by the Office, "a hierarchical namespace including a set of types for a user interface organized into the hierarchical namespace, the hierarchical namespace including functionality to allow application-defined calculations to be performed" and "a top level identifier prefixed to the name of each group in the hierarchy so that the types in each group are referenced by a hierarchical name that includes the selected top level identifier prefixed to the name of the group containing the type." Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for it's input.

For at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 1 apply equally to these claims. The rejections of these claims are also improper as failing to show these claims' own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are not shown to be taught or suggested, either singly or in combination, in the references of record.

Claim 6 recites a system implemented by way of one or more computers, comprising:

- means for organizing a set of types for a user interface into a hierarchical namespace, the hierarchical namespace including functionality to allow application-defined calculations to be performed;
- means for exposing a first set of functions that enable re-usable controls of a user interface;
- means for exposing a second set of functions that enable re-usable dialogs of the user interface and re-usable wizards of the user interface;
- means for exposing a third set of functions that enable extending functionality of a desktop of the user interface, wherein the means for exposing the first set of functions including means for exposing one or more functions that allow items to be added to a sidebar of the desktop; and
- means for selecting a top level identifier and prefixing the name of each group with the top level identifier so that the types in each

group are referenced by a hierarchical name that includes the selected top level identifier prefixed to the name of the group containing the type.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office argues that the subject matter is obvious over WindowsXP Guide in view of Cadiz. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, this claim has been amended according to the suggestion of the Office to recite "means for organizing a set of types for a user interface into a hierarchical namespace, the hierarchical namespace including functionality to allow application-defined calculations to be performed" and "means for selecting a top level identifier and prefixing the name of each group with the top level identifier so that the types in each group are referenced by a hierarchical name that includes the selected top level identifier prefixed to the name of the group containing the type." Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for its input.

For at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

Claims 7-11 depend from claim 6 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 6 apply equally to these claims. The rejections of these claims are also improper as failing to show these claims' own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 6, are not shown to be taught or suggested, either singly or in combination, in the references of record.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 11/13/2007   By: /David W. Foster/
                                 David W. Foster
                                 Reg. No. 60,902
                                 (509) 324-9256 ext 219